

Serial No. 10/634,391
Atty. Doc. No. 2003P11518US

REMARKS

Applicant gratefully appreciates the Examiner's notation of allowable subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 4. Thus, claims 1-23 are pending in the application and presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks:

Response to Rejections under Section 112:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-19 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner requiring the newly added limitation to be explicitly supported by the original disclosure, or a clear explanation be provided as to how the limitation is derived from the original disclosure if support is considered to be implicit.

In response Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite terminology more explicitly supported by the original disclosure but no less limiting than the prior claim language. Claim 1 now recites that the partially filled three dimensional shapes have an outer skin that encapsulates the shapes.

Support for the "three dimensional shapes" limitation can be found throughout the original disclosure. For example, page 9 lines 15-19 discloses that, without limitation, the shapes can be spheres, oblate spheroids and other shapes generally void of corners. All of these shapes are three dimensional. For another example, page 10, lines 2-3 discloses that the internal structure need not be three dimensional, thereby implying that

OAR#2.DOC

6

Serial No. 10/634,391
Atty. Doc. No. 2003P11518US

the internal structure may be three dimensional. Any shape that that surrounds the three dimensional structure necessarily must be three dimensional.

Support for the "outer skin that encapsulates the shapes" limitation can also be found throughout the original disclosure. For another example, page 13 lines 17-19 discloses that the outer layer may provide an encapsulation function. For another example, page 11 lines 26-28 discloses that the sealing skin can enhance processing versatility. The term "sealing" implies encapsulation.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 112 rejection.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/15/06

By: 
John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

OAR#2.DOC

7